

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
WORKSHOP
MAY 22, 2001
2:15 P.M**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 2:27 p.m. Board members present were Chair Jeff Evans, James Aucamp, Jr., Sam Engel, Jr. (arrived at 3:05 p.m.) and Vice-Mayor Judy Paul. Also in attendance were Planner Marcie Nolan, Planner Scott McClure, and Board Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice-Chair Marcellino was absent.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Griffin Road Architectural Design Guidelines

Ms. Nolan stated that this issue was brought before the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) which had recommended approval. She advised that this was important because there was a section in the Land Development Regulations for architectural design theme that "excluded the function of the Agency's boundaries." Ms. Nolan showed a map that depicted the Agency's area. She stated that this issue was tentatively scheduled to go before the Town Council on June 6, 2001.

Ms. Nolan indicated that the purpose of this workshop was to work with this Committee so that it would be comfortable with the final plan before being adopted. The introduction was created to let the developer know the rules and regulations for the Griffin Road corridor and it included a history. The intent was to enrich the existing downtown along Davie Road. The elements that were addressed in the document included a pedestrian-friendly environment, building placement, protection from the elements, conducive paint colors, architectural style, building materials, and master landscaping. She also described the process and how the guidelines were researched. Ms. Nolan stated that the Florida masonry vernacular was an acceptable architectural style and added that wood siding or stucco could be used.

Chair Evans felt that the renderings offered did not meet Code, especially the stucco facade, and felt it would give the wrong impression to developers and architects. There was discussion regarding what image to use on the cover and Chair Evans felt that the one that had a three-story building would be more representative. He asked if tin shingles were allowed. Ms. Nolan replied affirmatively and added that asphalt, cedar or slate shakes were allowed as well. It was clarified that cement or clay tiles were not permitted.

Ms. Nolan stated that Shaker style buildings were recommended. She stated that "Hardi-plank" was less expensive than premium cedar siding and required less maintenance. Ms. Nolan advised that vinyl siding was not permitted and a brief discussion ensued regarding exterior building materials.

Ms. Nolan referred to the guideline and discussed the history of architecture that was described therein. She stated that architects would be given the styles they could choose from and described the various features.

Mr. Aucamp asked about the Walgreens' project and wanted to know if Walgreens would act as an anchor for the area. Ms. Nolan indicated that Walgreens was somewhat

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

MAY 22, 2001

agreeable to architectural style, but there were concerns with placement of the building and the parking. Mr. McClure indicated that the Town was presenting Walgreens with architectural options. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that Walgreens had made some adjustments but they were still not in complete compliance to the Code. She stated that this was an attempt to show Walgreens their options.

Chair Evans stated that he would like to see the Walgreens proposal before it went to Council. CRA Administrator Will Allen stated that the plan was intended to come before the Committee before it went to Council. Chair Evans felt it was the purpose of this Committee to monitor aesthetics and staff was responsible for the Code, so Council would have the support they needed to take appropriate action. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that Walgreens would be submitting an entirely new plan.

Mr. Aucamp again asked if the intention was to have Walgreens as an anchor to the area. Ms. Nolan indicated that the goal was to have the corner of Davie Road and Griffin Road as the cornerstone of the area. Mr. Aucamp pointed out that Walgreens did not want to have the entranceway in the front.

Chair Evans referred to the Goodman building as an example of where there was an agreement to put an awning around the front of the building and the owner was paid to do this as part of the Griffin Road widening project, yet it was never done. Ms. Nolan indicated that there was still work going on in this area and they might be waiting for it to be completed. Ms. Nolan stated that staff had looked at this building and had asked the owner to abide by the guidelines.

Mr. Aucamp asked if a new business was to occupy one of the existing buildings and they wanted to get an occupational license, would they have to comply with the building guidelines. Ms. Nolan indicated that they would have to bring it up to Code, which meant they would have to meet the Land Development guidelines and the official guidelines of the Town. She stated that many of the existing structures were torn down because of the Griffin Road project and owners were compensated monetarily.

Ms. Nolan further described the details of the guidelines where columns were concerned. She spoke of the two styles for frame architecture, which included the false front that was typical of the Western theme and the "temple form building." She stated that most commercial structures would follow the latter.

Ms. Nolan spoke of the goals and general requirements of the district. She stated that the primary goal of the architectural standards was to establish authenticity and traditional character. She clarified that the buildings were to be functional, not just to look functional.

Chair Evans asked if masonite siding was permitted. He explained that if it was not installed properly, it could be problematic. Chair Evans pointed out that the use of masonite was not mentioned in the guidelines under "Siding," therefore a decision should be made

about its permitted use. He clarified that they were deciding on a design standard, which was visual not material and he felt it was inappropriate to add name brands to the guidelines. Ms. Nolan pointed out that the goal was to have the buildings resemble those

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

MAY 22, 2001

from the turn of the century, but realized that wood siding was very expensive.

Ms. Nolan referred back to the guidelines and summarized the five projecting elements permitted and stated that each building must contain one of the five. She stated that if an access drive was used, then 20 feet of landscaping was necessary. Otherwise, 30 feet of landscaping would be required.

Mr. Engel felt it was not possible to maneuver into a nine-foot space with a 10-foot access. Ms. Nolan indicated that although the Engineering Department was concerned with this, it was in the Code.

Ms. Nolan pointed out the build-to line and the required walkway. Chair Evans felt this was a good concept because the developer was able to get the maximum square footage.

Mr. Engel clarified that although the build-out could be ten feet, the columns had to be 18 inches. Ms. Nolan clarified that the columns had to be 18 inches from the curb. Mr. Engel pointed out that the curbing was at the backside of the parallel parking. Ms. Nolan realized that this was a conflict and stated she would check into it. She stated that the language had to be changed for this because it was a safety issue.

Mr. Engel pointed out that a front porch required two steps, which would create an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) conflict because a 14-foot ramp would have to be built. Ms. Nolan was confident that this could be accomplished, but realized that the ramp had to be part of the regular sidewalk. Mr. Engel cited the guidelines where it indicated that there would be porches up to 30 inches in height and stated that a 30-foot ramp would be necessary.

Ms. Nolan stated that the porch was one of the options. She also explained that having a porch would offer some privacy for the occupant. Chair Evans pointed out that the buildings with the porches would be private residences. Mr. Engel stated that with a private residence, a handicapped ramp was not necessary. Ms. Nolan explained that a porch could extend a maximum of ten feet in front of the build too line, but could not be extended to the sidewalk.

There was discussion regarding access drives and how they would be placed. Ms. Nolan stated that the goal was for all occupants to have an access drive, but it was dependent on the master plan which would specifically state which properties had to have an access drive. She stated that the sidewalk and landscaping would be cohesive although there would be variations in access drives and architecture.

Ms. Nolan referred to the guideline regarding exterior materials. Chair Evans reiterated that name brands should not be included and felt that it should say "durable, weather-resistant, high-quality, exterior materials." He stated that the look of vinyl siding depended on the trim package that went with it. Ms. Nolan stated that this type of detail was not included and not necessary. Chair Evans felt that these details were important if

aesthetics were important. Ms. Nolan asked what grade of siding should be mentioned. Mr. Engel stated that the thickness of the siding determined the quality. Mr. Aucamp pointed out the samples would have to be brought to the Committee before the site plan was approved, so the quality could be monitored at that level. Ms. Nolan stated that she would

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

MAY 22, 2001

speak with the consultant to get his opinion on this as she felt the consultant would want to stay with more traditional materials. Chair Evans stated that developers would try to use the minimum they were permitted and most would use stucco. Vice-Mayor Paul agreed that stucco would be most popular because it was least expensive.

Ms. Nolan liked the idea of allowing more exterior material options, but previously thought siding would look cheap. She felt that if this Committee agreed there were siding materials that would keep the aesthetic standard high, it would definitely be considered. Chair Evans reiterated that the siding had to include the high quality trim package.

Ms. Nolan referred to the guideline section regarding the appearance of storefronts, which should be as transparent as possible covering 50 to 70 percent of the wall area. She explained that Walgreens disagreed with this because they did not want to lose shelving space. She stated that the transparency was essential to the architectural style.

Chair Evans stated that metal french doors would be better than wood french doors because the latter were troublesome. Mr. Engel pointed out that the guideline was calling for six-panel wood doors rather than french doors. Chair Evans felt this did not belong in the vernacular and felt that the term "panelized door" was better than "wood panelized door." Ms. Nolan pointed out that french doors were acceptable as well.

Ms. Nolan referred to the guideline section regarding roof gutters and dormers and read the permitted and non-permitted materials and design. She also read the section regarding general requirements for windows.

Mr. Engel pointed out that there were no termite resistant woods besides cedar and cedar did not hold up well. Chair Evans again was concerned with the use of wood. Ms. Nolan pointed out that the materials should be touchable because the goal was to have the "buildings to be true." Chair Evans wanted the buildings to last and felt that wood was a high maintenance material. He felt if it looked like wood and was a high quality material, it should be permitted.

Ms. Nolan stated that she would take all ideas and suggestions formulated from this workshop back to the consultant. Chair Evans wanted these guidelines to be developer-friendly, and felt they should have options so that they could achieve the intended theme.

Mr. Aucamp asked if there could be landscaping against the building. Ms. Nolan stated that it varied depending on the design of the building and the projecting elements. Mr. Aucamp was concerned about the landscaping in front of the building as they would be varied, they would be maintained at different levels, and irrigation systems would be different. Ms. Nolan indicated that the irrigation plans and a maintenance agreement were required at site plan.

Mr. Aucamp felt the properties would be developed up to the east and west property lines. Ms. Nolan disagreed because access for the parking areas and parking spaces were required.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MAY 22, 2001**

There was discussion regarding when this workshop would be continued and it was decided, because of time constraints, that it would be completed as item 4.1 at the end of the Site Plan Committee meeting immediately following this meeting.

3. ADJOURNMENT

There being no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member